



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/911,023	07/23/2001	David B. Lektion	RSW920010079US1	3490

7590 11/29/2004

Mark D. Simpson, Esquire  
Synnestvedt & Lechner  
2600 Aramark Tower  
1101 Market Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19107-2950

EXAMINER

POPHAM, JEFFREY D

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2137

DATE MAILED: 11/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/911,023

Applicant(s)

LECTION ET AL.

Examiner

Jeffrey D. Popham

Art Unit

2137

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 02 January 2002 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |                                                                                                    |                                                                             |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)               | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____                                                 |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>02012002</u> .                                                            | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____                                     |

***Remarks***

Claims 1-18 are pending.

***Drawings***

1. Figures 1A and 1B should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.121(d)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

***Specification***

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

- Page 6, line 16: "-zipcode"- should be "-zipcode"-.

Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Objections***

3. Claims 4, 5, 8, 10, 11, 16, and 17 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 (a) because of the following informalities:

- The first line of each of claims 4, 5, 10, 11, 16, and 17 recites the limitation "said nodes". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims. For purposes of prior art rejection in this office action, "said nodes" will be construed as "said parent node and said child nodes".
- In line 3 of claim 8, "means assigning" should be "means for assigning".

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 13, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by Rys et al. (U.S. Patent 6,704,736).

Regarding Claim 7,

A system for controlling access by a parent node to child nodes in a DOM tree, comprising:

Means for assigning a parent-node context-value to said parent node (Column 7, lines 34-41; id as parent-node context-value);

Means for assigning a child-node context-value to each of said child nodes (Column 7, lines 34-41; parent id as child-node context-value);

Means for correlating one or more of said child nodes to said parent node (Column 7, lines 45-47); and

Means for permitting access by said parent node only to said correlated child nodes (Column 7, lines 45-47). Since all children are correlated to the parent node, the parent node has access only to the correlated children.

Regarding Claim 1,

Claim 1 is a method claim that is substantially equivalent to system claim 7. Therefore, claim 1 is rejected under a similar rationale.

Regarding Claim 13,

Claim 13 is a computer program product with computer-readable medium claim that is substantially equivalent to system claim 7.

Therefore, claim 13 is rejected under a similar rationale.

Regarding Claim 8,

A system as set forth in claim 7, wherein said means for correlating comprises at least:

Means for assigning the child-node context-value of said correlated child nodes to be the same as the parent-node context-value (Column 7, lines 45-47).

Regarding Claim 2,

Claim 2 is a method claim that is substantially equivalent to system claim 8. Therefore, claim 2 is rejected under a similar rationale.

Regarding Claim 14,

Claim 14 is a computer program product with computer-readable medium claim that is substantially equivalent to system claim 8.

Therefore, claim 14 is rejected under a similar rationale.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 3, 9, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rys et al. (U.S. Patent 6,704,736) in view of Kloba et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0,047,394).

Regarding Claim 9,

Rys et al. do disclose the existence of a child-node context-value and a parent-node context-value, but do not disclose the fact that the child-node context-value is inherited from the parent-node context-value.

Kloba et al., however, disclose that the child nodes inherit information from the parent nodes (Detailed Description, Paragraph 392).

This new system would be the system of Rys et al. inheriting the child-node context-value from the parent-node context-value, as in Kloba et al.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to inherit the child-node context value from the parent-node context value in order to dynamically link the children to the parent. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to dynamically share the behavior and properties of the objects.

Regarding Claim 3,

Claim 3 is a method claim that is substantially equivalent to system claim 9. Therefore, claim 3 is rejected under a similar rationale.

Regarding Claim 15,

Claim 15 is a computer program product with computer-readable medium claim that is substantially equivalent to system claim 9.

Therefore, claim 15 is rejected under a similar rationale.

6. Claims 4, 10, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rys et al. (U.S. Patent 6,704,736) in view of Dray et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0,184,485) further in view of Voldal (U.S. Patent 5,745,570).

Regarding Claim 10,

Rys et al. do not disclose that the system uses encryption.

Dray et al., however, disclose a system wherein the nodes are encrypted (Detailed Description, Paragraph 94) and means for permitting access to the nodes comprises means for decrypting the nodes (Detailed Description, Paragraph 115). This new system would be the system of Rys et al. applying encryption to the nodes, as in Dray et al.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to use the encryption from Dray et al. in the system of Rys et al. in order to provide security against unauthorized users accessing certain nodes. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to allow only the originator and intended recipients to view the contents of the node (Detailed Description, Paragraph 81, lines 1-6).

Dray et al. do not disclose the fact that the nodes are encrypted when they are assigned names.

Voldal, however, discloses the fact that the nodes (objects) are encrypted when they are created (Column 5, lines 55-67). This new system would be the system from above encrypting the nodes upon creation (when they are assigned names), as in Voldal.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to encrypt the nodes upon creation in order to provide better security in the system. One of ordinary skill in the art would



have been motivated to do so in order to limit access to object data  
(Column 6, lines 24-27).

Regarding Claim 4,

Claim 4 is a method claim that is substantially equivalent to system claim 10. Therefore, claim 4 is rejected under a similar rationale.

Regarding Claim 16,

Claim 16 is a computer program product with computer-readable medium claim that is substantially equivalent to system claim 10.

Therefore, claim 16 is rejected under a similar rationale.

7. Claims 5, 11, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rys et al. (U.S. Patent 6,704,736) in view of Kloba et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0,047,394) as applied to claim 9 above, further in view of Dray et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0,184,485) in view of Voldal (U.S. Patent 5,745,570).

Regarding Claim 11,

The system from above does not disclose that the system uses encryption.

Dray et al., however, disclose a system wherein the nodes are encrypted (Detailed Description, Paragraph 94) and means for permitting access to the nodes comprises means for decrypting the nodes (Detailed

Description, Paragraph 115). This new system would be the system from above applying encryption to the nodes, as in Dray et al.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to use the encryption from Dray et al. in the system from above in order to provide security against unauthorized users accessing certain nodes. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to allow only the originator and intended recipients to view the contents of the node (Detailed Description, Paragraph 81, lines 1-6).

Dray et al. do not disclose the fact that the nodes are encrypted when they are assigned names.

Voldal, however, discloses the fact that the nodes (objects) are encrypted when they are created (Column 5, lines 55-67). This new system would be the system from above encrypting the nodes upon creation (when they are assigned names), as in Voldal.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to encrypt the nodes upon creation in order to provide better security in the system. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to limit access to object data (Column 6, lines 24-27).

Regarding Claim 5,

Claim 5 is a method claim that is substantially equivalent to system claim 11. Therefore, claim 5 is rejected under a similar rationale.

Regarding Claim 17,

Claim 17 is a computer program product with computer-readable medium claim that is substantially equivalent to system claim 11.

Therefore, claim 17 is rejected under a similar rationale.

8. Claims 6, 12, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rys et al. (U.S. Patent 6,704,736) in view of Jacobs (U.S. Patent 6,681,221).

Regarding Claim 12,

Rys et al. do not disclose that each of the child nodes is assigned a unique child-node context-value wherein only one of the child nodes is correlated to the parent node by having the same child-node context-value as the parent has parent-node context-value.

Jacobs, however, discloses that each of the child nodes is assigned a unique reference number (Column 4, lines 24-38) and that only 1 child link name can correlate to the link name the parent is searching for (Column 4, lines 24-38). This new system would be the system from Ryn et al. having the correlation technique from Jacobs.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to use the correlation technique of Jacobs into the system of Rys et al. in order to allow the parent access to only the

correlated child that the parent is searching for. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to keep one group from accessing the nodes that are only supposed to be accessed by a different group (Column 3, line 28-36).

Regarding Claim 6,

Claim 6 is a method claim that is substantially equivalent to system claim 12. Therefore, claim 6 is rejected under a similar rationale.

Regarding Claim 18,

Claim 18 is a computer program product with computer-readable medium claim that is substantially equivalent to system claim 12.

Therefore, claim 18 is rejected under a similar rationale.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey D. Popham whose telephone number is (571)-272-7215. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571)-272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2137

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Andrew Caldwell  
Andrew Caldwell